

Flintshire County Council

Local Development Plan (LDP) Examination

HEARING STATEMENT

Hearing Session 3: Strategic Growth (including Strategic Sites)

Response by Wales & West Housing Association Limited (Consultee ID 1230461) Re: Land at Liverpool Road, Buckley

March 2021



Preamble

Matter 3: Strategic Growth (including Strategic Allocations) _____.

Key Issue: Is the growth strategy coherent and based on a clear and robust preparation process? Is it realistic and appropriate in the light of relevant alternatives and is it based on robust and credible evidence?

The Matters to be Addressed for each site, under Question 3 of the Inspector's Matters ,Issues and Questions Agenda are responded to below under the appropriate headings.

- a) What is the justification for adopting an aspirational growth strategy, led by an ambitious target for new jobs?

The Local Development Plan identifies sites to accommodate 7,950 dwellings to deliver a housing requirement of 6,950, which includes a flexibility allowance of 15%.

Regardless of the disablement of TAN 1, the Council is still required to monitor housing land supply and to collate the information as part of the evidence base for the LDP. The Council therefore produces an annual monitoring report which follows the guidance in TAN1 and contains the Council's estimates of the number of units likely to be completed in the next five years. The latest is the 2019 study which shows a calculated supply of 3041 units.

In the 5 years (2015 – 2019 inclusive), since the 'end' of the Unitary Development Plan (2000-2015), the monitoring report shows annual average completions of 543, against an average annual LDP requirement of 463 (6,950 /15). This reflects a period during which the Unitary Development Plan was out of date . It is considered that these relatively high numbers were a result of the time lag it took in adopting the UDP (2011), so it only had a 'compact' 4 years left to run . Also the release of UDP sites which were proposed for allocation, but not allocated , ultimately came forward for housing as well in the absence of an up-to-date plan.

It is apparent therefore that the ten years which remain in the LDP period should make provision for a higher housing target, particularly as, given the number of dwellings already delivered in the first 5 years of the plan period, the remaining residual requirement will be reduced to just 423.5 (6,950 - 2715/10).

Furthermore the employment-led growth forecast needs to address potential consequences of the

b) When were i) the Northern Gateway site and ii) the Warren Hall site granted outline planning permission? Have circumstances changed significantly since then?

Northern Gateway

Outline planning permission (ref: 050125) was granted on 13th May 2014 for the Pochin Goodman Land and, on 7th January 2013(ref: 049320)

c) How will their strategic allocation in the LDP improve their viability and deliverability? Are the rates forecast for their delivery in the LDP realistic and achievable?

In terms of their viability and deliverability the two sites are considered in turn below. In our view as both of the sites have outline planning permission their allocation should not make any material difference to their viability and deliverability.

Northern Gateway

Concerns remain with regards to the Pochin Goodman part of the Northern Gateway Site and its ability to deliver the level of housing envisaged. The high level masterplan and delivery statement which has been prepared for this part of the Strategic Site provides an indication of the infrastructure which will be required and the anticipated timescales when development is expected to commence. In the case of the Pochin Goodman Northern Gateway element, a package of enabling works is still required to be implemented following reserved matters approval. This has only just been oly bly terplnhin

